

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the comments in the Action. They have helped us considerably in understanding the Action and in drafting this Response thereto.

5 It is our understanding that claims 1-7 remain pending in this application, wherein claims 1-4 have been acknowledged by the Examiner as being directed to allowable subject matter.

The § 101 rejections:

Claims 5-7 are rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Responsive to 10 this, Applicant herein amends claim 5. This amendment adds no new subject matter, since paragraph [0002] of the specification states “[i]t is anticipated that primary applications ... will be in manufacturing of highly precise assemblies and in industrial and laboratory processes requiring high precision position detection and control” and other discussion appears in the application, the sum of which we submit would clearly be understood by one of ordinary skill in 15 the art to entail a “transformation” or produce a “useful, concrete, and tangible result” (and thus to meet the tests in MPEP § 2106).

CONCLUSION

Applicant has endeavored to put this case into complete condition for allowance. It is 20 thought that the §101 rejections have all been corrected by amendment. Applicant therefore asks that all objections and rejections now be withdrawn and that allowance of all claims presently in the case be granted.

Intellectual Property Law Offices
1901 S. Bascom Ave., Suite 660
Campbell, CA 95008

Respectfully Submitted,


Raymond E. Roberts
Reg. No.: 38,597

Telephone: 408.558.9950
Facsimile: 408.558.9960
E-mail: RRoberts@iplo.com